The Examiner has rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,820,377, issued April 11, 1989, hereinafter referred to as "Davis").

Applicants' invention as recited in claim 6 recites:

> A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to control a semiconductor wafer processing system to perform the steps of:
>
> supplying a cleaning agent to a chamber;
>
> pumping said cleaning agent from the chamber;
>
> at least partially opening a gate valve coupled between said chamber and a turbomolecular pump; and
>
> drawing at least a portion of said cleaning agent through said turbomolecular pump.

In Applicants' claim 6, a computer-readable medium causes a processor to draw at least a portion of a cleaning agent through a turbomolecular pump (see the specification at page 9, lines 3-4).

Davis fails to disclose drawing a cleaning agent through a turbomolecular pump. By contrast, Davis discloses a method and apparatus for manufacturing integrated circuits (see Davis at column 8, line 5). The apparatus has a process chamber 218 (see Davis at column 24, line 43 and FIG. 9) that may be cleaned using a gas mixture (see Davis at column 25, lines 4-5 and line 35). Davis also discloses a load lock chamber (see Davis at column 56, line 24) that is evacuated with a turbomolecular pump (see Davis at column 57, line 3).

Davis does not describe or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in claim 6, in which a computer-readable medium causes a processor to control a system that draws at least a portion of a cleaning agent through a turbomolecular

pump. Rather, Davis teaches a completely different invention in which a turbomolecular pump is used to evacuate a load lock chamber. Nowhere in Davis is there any teaching of drawing a cleaning agent through the turbomolecular pump.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim" (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (emphasis added). Davis fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim.

In particular, Davis does not teach a cleaning agent drawn through a turbomolecular pump. Therefore, each and every element has not been met by Davis. Furthermore, since Davis does not teach drawing a cleaning agent through a turbomolecular pump, Davis does not teach a computer-readable medium that causes a processor to do so.

As such, the Applicants submit that independent claim 6 fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and is patentable thereunder. Furthermore, claims 7-10 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 6. As such and for the same reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that these dependent claims are not anticipated from the teachings of the prior art and fully satisfy the requjirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are patentable thereunder.

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Raymond R. Moser Jr. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements may be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

8-22-02

Raymond R. Moser, Jr., Attorney
Reg. No. 34,682
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
Suite 100
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702

Please continue to send correspondence to:

Patent Counsel
Applied Materials, Inc.
P.O. Box 450A
Santa Clara, CA 95052

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION under 37 C.F.R.§ 1.8

I certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 on August 22, 2002 and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, Facsimile Number: 703-872-9310.

Kathleen Faughnan
Type or print name of person signing certification

Kathleen Faughnan
Signature